Nixon/Psychological; Missing Tapes; Impeachment/-resignation, Jaworski, [illegible]

There was no Post today (strike). I've kept up on recent news fairly well. Today I had AP's am B wire, before-daylight, out-of-town all-news radio, several CBS 5-min. newscasts, about a half hour of WTOP radio while walking in a.m. and about an hour while sawing a tree mid afternoon. I also took in CBS-TV net evening news and a half-hour of the Post's syndicated Agronsky & Co. with Sidey, Rowan, Lisagor and Kilpatrick. More than usual electronic news.

This is the day on which the new low in tomorrow's Gallup pole is reported; on which two more pro-Nixon papers came out for his resignation or impeachment (Detroit News, Rocky Mt. News) and on which Bill Buckley's last night prediction that Nixon will resign (greeted by applause at Univ. Kansas) was reported.

It is the day after Nixon fled Washington in such anger or panic that he lied about his intention to the press and fled without any of it or most of his advisers. Or, a new time of new crisis for him in orthodoc terms.

There is much I believe relevant that I have not heard mentioned and have not seen written about. One example is the complete lack of questioning about Jaworski when it is obvious that he has to have the same problems Cox had or has to be a stooge. There can't be much middle ground if, as I do, one regards stalling, Nixon's game, as stonging for him. He has a public record from his JFK assassination role. Not one reporter, editor or talk-show personality who knows this and knows me has asked a single question. Several media elements have just not wanted to do anything with a good, legitimate story on one of his conflicts of interest. When checked out and added to by a subscriber who fed UPI, UPI did not put on the wire. I could run on about this, there is that much of it. And the Agronsky gang wasx content to dismiss this with his reputation is at stake.

There has been much talk about impeachment/resignation. But none about who prosecutes. Not a single mention. It is Nixon's fink of the past and honcho of the present, his chief justice. Burger will control the evidence presented (and not presented) to the Senate if the House votes impeachment. There has been no assessment of Burger or his past or what happens if there is a party-line vote in the Senate and Nixon gets his required 1/3. Nor have I heard any discussion--even mention- of the possibility of a coup. There were a few minor references a while back. But in short thaere has been no real service to the people in this important area that is getting attention, resignation/impeachment. A few opinions and no substantial going over of his record. None as a totalitarian.

Even Peter Lisagor had his joke on the "missing" tapes: the Nixon liars told the truth this time and are caught up the first time they don't lie. The obvious alternative explanations have not been addressed after suggesting the possibility of dishonesty of some kind.

That he would flee as he did should have caused considerable assessment of his personal record of personal conduct. There is an abundance of evidence that addresses his mind and his state of mind. Is it not serious enough if we have an unbalanced President, one merely out of control or something less than a raving paranoid? Nothing is given to the people so that representative society can work. This, too, is the role of the press.

The great cowardice of the Congress is never mentioned. The suppressions are a taboo. What gets attention is statements like EMK's, that the first need is to put Ford in.

With all this, there is no asking "Can there be more that we don't know?" Suppose there is worse than has emerged? Can it not be conceived that with all this evil there is no reason to assume there can't be more?

From the stories and the commentaries nobody is thinking ahead and wondering what diversion Nixon will pull next. He has not been without tricks, as when was he ever? The pst - his past - is not only not mentioned, it isn't ever considered.

Imagine what it means when a man with the experience and intelligence of Lisagor says with seriousness, actually meaning it, that these tapes no not exist only by happence and that crowd of agents at the White House can't do anything right. It is to say that he does not believe there is incriminating evidence and that it does not have to be destroyed, among other things. It is to say that after all he has said hiself and heard and read he remains unwilling to consider that any more serious charge can lay against Nixon than bad judgement in chosing his friends and advisers.

Knowing for an accepted month that these tapes at issue in court did not exist, Nixon himself and his lawyers and friends went through all of this in court and didngt saya word even to the lawyers who were being exposed to this? Bull also was silent knowing the "truth?" The Agronsky panel accepted this as terribly stupid, so we have a stupid President, and that is past.

That there can have been this endless string of endless lies and they are not interpreted as having any meaning? So, we got a liar for a President too? No more? No real purpose in lying?

Even the simple arithmetic of Haldeman and the tapes has not been done.

Nobody has yet had an account of the taping system, so there is no way of knowing if the Nixon story can be possible. On the face of it there is not much likelihood of any part of it being true.

No reason for Nixon to flee? No coincidence between this thing starting to come apart and the uncontrobable urge to get out of town, with two notables in town and with his big pretense of being the indispensible one who works it all out?

Initially the repprting was good, after they got past letting the Post alone have the whole story and until after the excesses of Nixon and those who speak for him gave little choice but to pick the story up. Not investigative reporting, leak repeating for the most part.

Then there was the Senate to leak a little, so there was less neeed for any effort.

And then it got to the point where the Senate was dishing it out openly. I have copies of some pretty good and entirely unreported stuff stamped not to be removed from the Senate Press Gallery.

Hunt blabs about CIA domestic-intelligence activities and no paper carries it? His opening statement has stuff along this line and no paper carries his statement or picks this up or follows it when all reporters have to know that the leads in Hunt's opening statement about domestic CIA activity lead to two men both of whom lead to the White House? This is reporting?

The committee got so careless it let out proof of perjury, and no paper picked it up. Not even those who uncritically printed the proof of CIA perjury?

These and more like them and going back pretty far give Nixon all the reading he needs. He is not smart. He is very careless. And the case is that bad he can't begin to hide much. (This is to say that there is much more that can come out but there is more than enough that is out and none of it has been followed up by the press.) Without the accurate reading, Nixon would not have dared try to pull what he has the way he has.

...

There is one aspect of this that was surprising to me until I thought about it. I had always believed that in this country less than any other was it possible for a conspiracy of many members to succeed. That this could have been started without a word leaking out; that it could have gone as long without any real investigation; and that so much has not come out, with so many willing working to suppress all that can be surpressed, seems to say that there can be large conspiracies. However, this would have to be qualified because the power of the President is behind it. So, if it is possible for a conspiracy to endure for some time, from this its continuation depends on the failure of all the agencies of society, all at one time, and on the use of the greatest power of the government.

But also from this, neither the press nor the Congress will do anything that has any real meaning when there is so vast a conspiracy inside the executive branch. This, in all aspects, including the silence of multitudes, is not really new. It was true of the JFK assassination investigation. Thousands knew it was false, even LBJ. But all hewed the official line, Johnson even in public when he was morally certain what he said was not and could not be true.